

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/022,228

Applicant(s)

YAMAGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Hung Henry V Nguyen

Art Unit

2851

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hung Henry V Nguyen.

(3)_____.

(2) George Simion.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 23 July 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15.


Identification of prior art discussed: Wakui (U.S.Pat. 5,900,707) and Saeki (JP-124843).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


HENRY HUNG NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant submitted proposed amendment. Claim 14 has been cancelled and claim 15 has been amended. Comments discussed during the interview are: Saeki and/or Wakui does not suggest determining information relating to an offset in the predetermined plane of the mask on the stage caused by movement of the stage based on the detected information showing the relationship between the acceleration of the stage and the offset of the mask and suggesting adjusting a relative positional between the mask and the substrate in the manner as recited in amended claim 15. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review and update search when a official response is filed. The Examiner thanks the Applicant for pointing out the differences between the cited references and the claimed invention and will give them full consideration in the next office action..